

Baconiana.

VOL. VIII.—*New Series.* APRIL, 1900.

No. 30.

“BACONISM—PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.”

“Seeds and weak Beginnings which Time shall bring
to Ripeness.”

SINCE the establishment of the Bacon Society in 1883 many changes have taken place, and great advance has been made in the various branches of knowledge which it is our purpose to investigate and elucidate—knowledge, that is, of the real life, works, and aims of Francis St. Alban, better known as “Bacon.”

In the first instance, the chief (and with many persons the sole) object of Baconian students was to prove whether or no Francis Bacon wrote the Plays and Poems called “*Shakespeare?*” If so, when and where did he write them? Why, if he wrote them, did he conceal his authorship? Assuming the low estate of the theatre in his day to have been accountable for his reticence, yet why, *in after times*, was that secret, which must have been known to scores of persons (friends, secretaries, publishers, printers, &c.), still carefully kept and guarded?

With regard to the main question, “*Did Francis Bacon write ‘Shakespeare?’*” there was in it nothing new. So long ago as 1850 it was discussed by three lawyers (one afterwards Chief Justice, another a Privy Counsellor). These learned men scouted the idea that a tyro in the profession could have written the law in “*Shakespeare*,” or so “tampered with our Freemasonry.” One pronounced the legal knowledge to be that of “*an Attorney General* ;” another added, “*Say, of a Lord Chancellor.*”

Two years later than this conversation, an article in *Chambers’ Journal* opened thus:—“Who Wrote ‘Shakspeare?’” asked Miss Kitty, in “*High Life Below Stairs*,” the article then proceeding to discuss the elementary question.

In 1857 a remarkable book was published in America, by Delia Bacon, on “*The Philosophy of the Shakespeare Plays*” compared with that of her great namesake. The conclusions

at which this learned student had arrived were not explicitly stated in her book, but they were sufficiently clear to raise the wrath of Shakespeareans, and to inaugurate the never-ended controversy. It must be to the eternal credit of Nathaniel Hawthorne that when Delia Bacon—poor, unbefriended by her own family, and at that time unsupported by literary opinion—underwent the inevitable course of persecution which befalls us all, and which ended in deranging her fine intellect, he alone helped and protected her, his poetic insight probably enabling him the more readily to enter into, and sympathise with, her views.

In that same year (1857) Mr. William Henry Smith published a "*Letter to Lord Ellesmere*," of which he personally gave the following account:—

"I was member of a Debating Society which met periodically to discuss all manner of things, and at the end of each meeting we used to arrange the programme of the next debate. One evening nobody had anything to propose, so after a little hesitation, I got up and said: '*Let it be debated whether or no Francis Bacon wrote "Shakespeare."*' This proposal was received with howls of derision. The idea was ridiculous, monstrous, could not be entertained, and so forth. John Stuart Mill was present, and he put in his word in my favour. No one, he said, had any suggestion to make, and doubtless Mr. Smith had some grounds for his motion. He therefore voted that Mr. Smith should be invited to state his case on the side of Bacon at the next meeting."

The result was the reading of Mr. Smith's paper which, elementary and superficial as it may now seem, produced such a revulsion of feeling that he was requested to have it printed in the form of a "*Letter to Lord Ellesmere*," then President of the first Shakespeare Society.

Needless to say that although the Shakespeareans expressed much interest in the "*Letter*," it was allowed to fall flat, and so far as we have ascertained, no member of the Shakespeare Society made any effort to follow up and examine, prove, or disprove, the positive statements formulated by Mr. Smith. Certainly none of these have been disproved.

It should be observed in passing that no one amongst these early exponents of the Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy professed to be *the first*. Delia Bacon, with much ability, expressed or suggested a great deal of which later writers have made use. She was the first *deep* writer on the subject, and seems to have thought out her theories and conclusions

without help from others, but from a close and penetrative study of the philosophy of the great author himself.

William Henry Smith does not seem to have known of Delia Bacon's existence when he first attempted to formulate, and to speak out before an ignorant and disdainful public, the results of his own researches. All honour be to him as the leader of a forlorn hope which first made a breach, and stormed the citadel.

But it does not appear that in modern times any one individual *originated*, or professed to have originated, the theory that "Bacon wrote 'Shakespeare';" that the name "*Shakespeare*" was, and is, a *non-de-plume*, a "mask" for the true author. It seems (with present knowledge) impossible to doubt that this fact has been always acknowledged, and traditionally handed down by a certain select and high circle of his own (partly secret) society. For the present let this pass, whilst we state briefly some of the grounds for confident belief that the author of "*Bacon's*" works is identical with the author of "*Shakespeare*," and of many other works.

LITERARY GROUNDS OF BELIEF.

These grounds are identical with those upon which "the learned" have hitherto based all arguments and proofs in favour of the genuineness of other writings, from the Books of the Bible itself, to the Poems of *Homer* or the *Letters of Junius*. What are these grounds? To this question, the answer, in nineteen cases out of twenty, has been to this effect:—"We judge of the authorship, partly by internal and circumstantial evidence, but *chiefly by the style of writing*." Let us attack the last proposition first—"The style of writing." We ask, "What is style?" and the answer is usually prompt and decided: "Oh, everybody knows what *style* is. It is the way people write. There are grand, solemn, stilted, or affected styles; or simple, homely, unvarnished styles; styles pithy, dry, brief, business-like; or, on the other hand, diffuse, florid, graceful, poetical. Any one can see the difference in *style*."

True, but seeing differences does not explain them; moreover, without extending our researches beyond the "*Shakespeare*" Plays themselves, "anyone can see the difference in style" amongst them. So great is the diversity that critics have been driven to account for them by imagining a multiplicity of authorships for "*Shakespeare*." They seem to say: "Let us carve him as a dish fit for the gods." Reserving

for himself and his fame the noblest parts, the cruder, weaker or coarser passages of his earlier days they apportion amongst his many masks. The style, they see, is so different between this or that play or passage. It does not seem to have struck the early commentators that the "Chameleon," "Proteus," the ebbing and flowing "Eripos," could for ever keep on changing his colour, shape, and motion; and *some still* deny the possibility of this, in spite of the kaleidoscopic variations in matter, colouring, plot, "*style*" of the much admired and disputed plays.

Hear now what our Francis says about this very point of *style*. After discussing in detail the many particulars needful, but in his day "*deficient*," for building up a noble model of language (noting as he goes, the existing poverty of language, the absence of words suitable for the expression of fine thoughts, the lack of literary ornaments, the loss even of the metaphors and figurative expressions by which in rude ages the world had been taught and elevated), he speaks of style in general, and this is what he says:—

"Style is as the subject-matter."

Here is a whole treatise in a nutshell. The style of a writer must vary according to the matter of which he discourses, or the nature of the individual who is supposed to be speaking. It is needless to return to details already printed in *BACONIANA*,* and which interest those only *who wish to know*. Such studious souls may, however, be assured that those who persist that *Bacon* and *Shakespeare* were different authors, because "their style is so different," have merely adopted a well-sounding form of words for the sake of upholding an argument disproved by examination of the facts. We earnestly invite all who sincerely desire to *prove all things*, to join hands with us in bringing truth to light, if only on this one point.

THE WORK OF COLLATION BEGUN.

Bacon urges that before men proceed to generalise, they should collect particulars. Inductive philosophy first, deductive last, true deductions being only possible when based upon facts. To give ever so brief an account of the work quietly going on during the past fifteen or twenty years must

* See Vol. I. (*First Series*), pp. 2—13. Vol. I. (*Second Series*), pp. 124—138. Vol. III., pp. 2—7, 45—54, 166, 167. Vol. IV., pp. 198, 199, 208—220. Vol. V. pp. 125—136. Vol. VI. pp. 1—11, 22—30.

be, to most of us, but as the telling of an old tale. Still, for the sake of many in our Society who did not begin with us, it seems desirable to epitomise.

So long ago as 1874 a series of dictionaries was begun with a view of making a comparative analysis of the works of *Bacon* and *Shakespeare*: on the one hand, the works Legal, Scientific, Literary, Philosophical and Religious; on the other, the Plays and Poetry. The contents of this group of MS. books of reference may be classed thus:—

1. Horticulture and Agriculture, with lists of Flowers, Fruits, Trees, &c., their uses, beauties, culture, &c.
2. Natural History of Beasts, Birds, Fishes, Reptiles, Insects, with their use in metaphor, &c.
3. Human Life, its Prolongation; Death.
4. Medicine and Surgery—Diseases, Remedies, Drugs, Poisons, &c.
5. The Union of Mind and Body—Imagination, Superstition, Lunacy, &c.
6. Demonology and Witchcraft—Fairies, Vital Spirits in Nature, &c.
7. Natural Science—Physics, Light, Heat, Fire, Magnetism, Motion, Force, Air, Water, Dense and Rare.
8. Sound, connected with Music, &c.
9. Chemistry—Metallurgy, Combustibles, &c.
10. The Senses—Sight, Hearing, Touch, Smell, Taste, Perfumes, &c.
11. Foods—Cookery, Drinks, Brewing, Distillation, Fermentation.
12. Dress, Personal Ornaments, Jewels, &c.
13. Furniture, Stuffs, Equipages.
14. Architecture and all connected with Building.
15. Military, Naval, and Engineering Terms and Appliances.
16. Law—Lists of Legal Terms, &c.
17. Divinity and Religious Opinions—Study of the Bible and Lists of Texts quoted.
18. Mythology—List of Mythical Personages, Creatures, Places, &c.
19. History Ancient and Modern.
20. Geography Ancient and Modern—Typography of London and the Environs.
21. Apparent allusions in the Plays to the Author's Personal Friends, Assistants, Agents, &c.

22. Apparent allusions to his known Habits, Health, Experiences.

23. Apparent allusions to his expressed thoughts, "fixed notions," sympathies, and antipathies.

24. The Arts—Painting, the Theatre, Dancing, Sports, Exercises, Games, &c.

25. Language and Diction—(a) Vocabulary; (b) Coined Words; (c) Provincial and Keltic Words; (d) French, Italian, and Spanish Words introduced or adapted; (e) Words modified from the Latin; (f) Words Technical, Scientific, or Legal, brought into familiar use; (g) Peculiar Uses of Words; (h) Coupling of Certain Words; (i) Alliterations; (j) Words strung together; (k) Repetitions; (l) Pleonasms; (m) Grammatical Peculiarities, illustrated from Dr. Abbott's "Shakespeare Grammar;" (n) *Promus* Notes, Turns of Speech, &c.; (o) Metaphors and Similies, Analogies, &c.; (p) Puns, Quibbles, Paradoxes, Ambiguities; (q) A Comparison of the 56 "Characteristics" of *Shakespeare's* language, taken from Cowden Clarke's "Shakespeare Key," with the same "characteristics" from *Bacon*.

To these collections is appended another showing the tendency of "Our Francis" (especially as he advanced in life), to let his prose run into metre, or blank verse. Specimens of poetry, translations, verses for recitation in Devices, &c., and versified Psalms (the first approach to *English* hymns, verses, set to music to be sung in churches), all are indubitably his, put forth (seemingly as *Samples*) to attract attention to a quantity of verses of the same kind, indistinguishable in style, and attributed by turns to various authors, or signed *Ignoto*, or *Anonymous*.

Such preliminary studies led continually to fresh observations and consideration. It became necessary to attempt to trace more closely the *private* life, and often inscrutable doings, of Francis Bacon, his relation to, or connection with many supposed authors, in whose writings coincidences are frequently noticeable, not only between each other, but between all of them, and himself. These coincidences in matter and manner usually include particulars which the great Philosopher-Rhetorician had pronounced "*deficient*"—"Formularies and Elegancies" introduced and noted by himself, advanced ideas, inventions, and *desiderata* which he himself had promulgated.

A second Series of Dictionaries was therefore commenced, in order to bring the newly-acquired observations and fragments of information into line with the former. All attainable facts as to the personality, and circumstances of the supposed Authors, are now being collected; their abodes, their travels, their tombs and epitaphs are anxiously inquired after, with the result that up to the present time, the abundant lack of authentic records concerning them, their birth, death, doings, or writings, is a matter of growing astonishment to the inquisitors. One thing is certain, there must have been, and *be*, scores, hundreds of writers, teachers, and men of letters who are perfectly well aware that the large majority of "Elizabethan and Jacobean" authors are men of straw.

CIPHERS.

Critics and Commentators were beginning to calm down on the "*Bacon-Shakespeare Controversy*," when the storm rolled up again at the first mention of the word "Cipher," in connection with *Shakespeare*. That Shakespeareans should resist the attempt to decipher Baconian matter from the Plays is easily to be understood. Why Baconians should, in many cases, have followed suit, is less comprehensible. Did not the Philosopher himself point out the need of ciphers, enumerating six kinds in particular, and explaining in some detail his own invention? But the subject was so old as to be new, and difficult to follow; moreover, it is easier to disparage than to try to understand.

In 1888, Mr. Donnelly, after years of patient labour, brought out his pioneer work, "*The Great Cryptogram*." The simultaneous chorus of praise and derision which attended this bold attempt to grapple with the tremendous problem, cannot be forgotten. Whatever may be the ultimate issue of present investigations and advancing knowledge, we must ever keep green in remembrance the name of the Discoverer and Reviver in modern times of the forgotten Art of Cryptography. Recently (Dec., 1899), Mr. Donnelly has published a sequel to his former work,* including the deciphering of the doggerel verse on the Shakespeare Gravestone.

A host of other decipherers have followed upon Mr. Donnelly's heels, usually diverging somewhat, and into other systems. This is not the place for explanatory details, but

* Sampson, Low, Marston & Co.

we must mention the remarkable results obtained by Mr. James Cary, Jun. (New York), who, by means of the "Clock" or "wheel," has worked out actual discoveries of secret facts, traced, and proved true only by means of the hints contained in the cipher. Other industrious and successful workers following in the lines of Mr. Donnelly are Mr. Wigston, Dr. Wilhelm Preyer, the Hon. Harry Gibson, Mr. E. V. Tanner, and Mr. Gould. All certify that ciphers of several kinds are embedded, not only in the *Shakespeare* folio of 1623, but seemingly in one edition, at least, of every work in which Francis had a hand.

Next came Dr. Orville Owen's discovery of a cipher formed by connecting (by specific rules) phrases and sentences, gathered by means of "keys," from certain books and pages. It has been thought a pity that the mode of proceeding was not explained, so as to enable anyone unpossessed of the keys to test and work out this cipher for themselves. In consequence the two large 8vo. volumes of deciphered matter were in this country somewhat discredited, and much of the opprobrium cast upon the efforts of Mr. Donnelly was now eagerly swept together again, and piled upon Dr. Owen. Nothing has come to our knowledge which evidences any effort made by hostile critics to prove or disprove the astounding statements made in this cipher. Here, besides a poem of "*The Spanish Armada*," a "*Tragedy of Mary, Queen of Scots*," and other matter, we find a painful episode in Elizabeth's girlhood, and the repeated assertion that (before 1558) she married secretly Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and that Francis was their eldest son, and true heir to the throne. These statements about the marriage seems to receive support from still more recent decipherings, but further proof is needed.

In assisting Dr. Owen in the preparation of his later books, Mrs. Gallup was led to study the "Bilateral" method of writing invented and described by Francis himself. His object seems to have been twofold: (1) To perpetuate a record of his true origin and history (which the Queen was resolved to suppress); (2) To secure his claim as author of the many works which were to be ushered into the world under fictitious names. The supposed writings of Peele, Greene, Marlowe, Spenser, and *Shakespeare*, and the "*Anatomy of Melancholy*" (assigned first to Bright, then to Burton), are here mentioned. Again the statements made in Dr. Owen's

cipher are repeated and enforced with considerable detail, and in graphic language. We are not attempting to review this extraordinary book, but only to draw attention to it as a work of intense interest. Without the book itself and full explanations before us, we could in no way make ourselves responsible for its utterances; but no one with any sense of justice or respect for truth will deliver judgment upon these deciphered narratives, who has not examined, and if possible verified or disproved the statements which they contain.

The presence of Cipher presumes the existence of a decipherer. Elaborate ciphers could not have been contrived, and inserted in prints without great expense and trouble, and probably by the collaboration of many persons. Such collaborators would not contrive and labour merely for each other's edification. Their purpose seems distinctly to have been the transmission to a wide-spread association, and the handing down to the future ages, secrets at the time too dangerous for publication. And what is such an association for the "Handing-down of the Lamp," but an "*Invisible Brotherhood*," a Secret Society? Similar fraternities existed in many forms from the earliest ages. Originally religious and mystical in character, they became in later times mixed up with politics, scientific research, alchemy, architecture, and the "black art" of printing. But all such organisations are found to have possessed certain common features, and to be based upon methods adopted or perfected by Francis St. Alban. His aim evidently was the construction of an automatic machine capable of preserving, transmitting, advancing and distributing knowledge through the whole wide world.

When first these things were discussed amongst Baconians, the tendency, whether from ignorance or from timidity was, without investigation, to discredit every proposition. Francis Bacon had nothing to do with Freemasonry, which is of immense antiquity. Rosicrucianism was quite disconnected with either. There was no evidence that Bacon was member of any Secret Society—it was a mistake to think that there were any mysteries connected with the Great Printing Houses, or that they affect our studies, and so forth. One by one these and similar objections have been examined, and in most cases their fallacies have been exposed. Much has been learnt, but there is much more to learn.

With regard to the "Foundations" of which Bacon speaks, we are still too ill-informed. It has been ascertained that he was the true founder of the great nursing mother of all the sciences, the Royal Society; he appears also to have been instrumental in reviving the neglected libraries at the Universities, the Cathedrals, Palaces, and other important seats of learning. He was also anxious for the endowment of scholarships and lectures, and it would be well if some of our members would take pains to investigate the origin and workings of many institutions, such as the Society of Antiquaries, with its publications and its *Quattuor Coronati*, the Bodleian Library, the Ashmolean and Camden Collection, the British Museum and other great centres of learning.

Another and very close inquiry should be made into the history of Paper-making, Printing, and all kindred Arts and Crafts here and abroad. These things seem all to be parts of the mighty machine designed by our Philosopher to move the mind of the world, and to keep it stirring. We surely begin to understand something of the mechanism, to interpret his marks and signs, his symbols and parabolic fictions, figurative phraseology, feigned names and anagrams. We can observe the disguised portraits and other particulars which conceal and reveal the ubiquitous author. Thus by fitting together many apparently disconnected fragments we are enabled to form in our mind's eye a tolerably distinct image of the "method" of Francis St. Alban and his influence for good during the past 300 years.

As method was used to conceal, so must it be also used to reveal. Probably "we are but young in deed;" a future generation may look upon our present knowledge as almost contemptible, or as a mere groping in the dark. We are content if it be a watching of the dawn. For let it be considered under what disadvantages we labour. We would gladly turn a search-light into the dark corners, but a kind of literary extinguisher is deftly clapped on to the smallest taper which may shed a ray upon the objects of our search. With "reserved" collections, garbled Indexes and References, double Catalogues, and a system of silent suppression, how is it possible to advance quickly? There is but one thing to be done—PERSEVERE.

“TIMON OF ATHENS.”

BACON entirely re-wrote the Essay of 1605—1612 upon *Friendship*. The British Museum Copy, I quote, is reprinted by Arber, in his collection of the Essays, and opens as follows:—“It had been hard for him that spake it, to have put more truth and untruth together, in few words, than in that speech; *Whosoever is delighted in solitude, is either a wild Beast or a God*. For it is most true, that a natural and secret hatred, and aversion towards society, in any man, *hath somewhat of the savage beast*. But it is most untrue, that it should have any character, at all, of the Divine Nature; except it proceed, not out of a pleasure in solitude, but out of a love and desire, to sequester a man’s self, for a higher conversation. Such as is found, to have been falsely and feignedly, in some of the heathen; as Epimenides the Candian, Numa the Roman, Empedocles the Sicilian, and Apollonius of Tyana. And truly and really, in divers of the ancient Hermits, and Holy Fathers of the Church.”—(*Essays*, 1625).

It is the object of this article to adduce evidence to show, how this passage applies to the character of Timon of Athens, as depicted in the Play, bearing his name. There are three points to be borne in mind for recognition, in the texts, going to be brought forward. I allude to these—*solitude*,—*the savage (beastlike) character*,—*the Divine*, of the man seeking it. Timon tells us himself of his intention of betaking himself to the *solitude* of the woods, in order to seek the fellowship of the *beasts*:—

Timon will to the woods; where he shall find
The unkindest *beast* more kinder than mankind,

—Act IV. i. 35.

Indeed Timon couples himself with the beasts, in these direct words:—

Alcibiades.—What art thou there? Speak.

Timon.—A *beast* as thou art. The canker gnaw thy heart,
For showing me again the eyes of man.—Act IV. iii. 49.

And Apemantus calls Timon “*beast*,” when he visits him in the woods.—Act IV. iii.

But besides these points, there is a large body of text, which revolves upon a comparison by Timon, of his fellowmen with beasts, so that the problem, or question, seems, subtly suggested to us by the author, of answering, or deciding who

the real beasts were? That is to say, were the "affable wolves," who eat Timon up (and forsook him afterwards), the disguised animals, or was it the other way and Timon the savage, he calls himself? The soldier discovering Timon's grave exclaims:—"Some *beast* rear'd this" (Act V. ii.). On the other hand, Timon's boundless bounty is clearly allied, in the Play, to exactly what Bacon calls *philanthropia*, in the accompanying passage:—"I take goodness in this sense, the affecting of the weale of men, which is that the Græcians called *Philanthropia*; and the word humanity is a little too light, to express it. Goodness I call the habit, and Goodness of nature, the inclination. This, of all virtues, and dignities of the mind, is the greatest, *being the Character of the Deity* (Adumbrata quædem effigies, et character;—*i.e.* a sort of shadowed likeness and character). And without it, man is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing; no better than a kind of vermin. Goodness answers to the Theological virtue Charity, and admits no excess, *but error*."—(*Goodness and Goodness of Nature*, 1625).

First, it is important to note, how Timon, and his character, is introduced in this Essay by Bacon: "*Misanthropi*, that make it their practise, to bring men, to the bough, and yet have never a tree, for the purpose, in their gardens as Timon had. Such dispositions are the very errors of human nature" (*Ib.*). Now there can be no doubt Timon is depicted in the Play, as a man of great goodness of nature, and of a charity whose very fault, lay not in its excess, *but rather in the "error"* of the choice of the persons, who benefitted by it. Timon is described:—

Merchant.—A most incomparable man, breathed as it were,
To an untirable and continue goodnes.—Act I. 10.

Poet.—His large fortune
Upon his good and gracious nature hanging
Subdues and properties to his love and tendance
All sorts of hearts—*Ib.* 56.

Flavius.—Poor honest lord, brought low by his own heart,
Undone by goodness!—Act IV. ii. 37.

Timon unfolds his own character, when he exclaims:—

Methinks I could deal kingdoms to my friends,
And ne'er be weary.—Act I. ii. 227.

And a lord describes him:—

O he's the very soul of bounty!—*Ib.* 216.

This bounty of Timon's is portrayed as something magical :—

Poet.—See

Magic of bounty! All these spirits thy power
Hath conjur'd to attend.—Act I. i.

But observe, that this, *goodness and goodness of nature*, so conspicuously seen in these texts, is also coupled with the Divine character of the Deity. For example, Timon's Steward commenting upon his master's misfortunes, as springing from bounty, exclaims :—

Strange unusual blood
When man's worst sin is, he does too much good!
Who then dares to be half so kind again?
For bounty that makes Gods, does still mar men.
My dearest lord, blessed to be most accursed,
Rich only to be wretched, thy great fortunes
Are made thy chief affliction.—Act IV. ii.

It seems, therefore, to myself, at least, that Timon of Athens has been set side by side with his false friends and flatterers, with a very deep purpose indeed. It has been seen, how Bacon declares that man, without this character of *goodness and goodness of nature*, "is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing; *no better than a kind of vermin*." Now this is an unmistakable hint for Timon's flatterers, who were really *parasites*, or *vermin*, living upon the former! Here is Timon's description of them :—

Live loathed and long
Most smiling, smooth, detested *parasites*,
Courteous destroyers, affable wolves, meek bears,
You fools of fortune, trencher friends, time's flies,
Cap and knee slaves, vapours, and minute jacks.

—Act III. vi. 104.

The student will, I think, not only be persuaded, that Bacon is pointing at Timon, in the passages indicated, but, as I proceed, perceive, that Timon's bounty, * has been made a peg for a parallel for Deity, on a small scale. Thus, Timon, in throwing off his false, and ungrateful friends, exclaims : "You great benefactors, sprinkle our society with thankfulness. For your own gifts make yourselves praised: *but reserve still to give, lest your Deities be despised*. Lend to each man enough, that one need not lend to another; *for were your Godheads to borrow of men, men would forsake the Gods*" (Act III. v. 79). In this ironical utterance, Bacon's con-

* To you

Whose star-like nobleness gave life and influence
To their whole being.—Act V. i.

ception of Deity, as Philanthropia, or Goodness of Nature, is indicated by Timon's past bounty. "It is the bounty that makes Gods," that is foreshadowed in Timon's character, and which he expected to find also in others, when it says of him:—

O, no doubt, my good friends, but the Gods themselves have provided that I shall have much help from you: how had you been my friends else? . . . O you Gods, think I, what need we have any friends, if we should ne'er have need of them?—Act I. ii. 91.

Of the *errors* of Goodness Bacon says:—"Errors, indeed in the virtue of *goodness*, or charity, may be committed. The Italians have an ungracious proverb: '*Tanto buon, che val niente*—*So good, that he is good for nothing.*' . . . Therefore to avoid the scandal and the danger both; it is good to take knowledge, of the *errors* of an habit, so excellent. Seek the good of other men, but be not in bondage, to their faces, or fancies; for that is but facility or softness; which taketh an honest mind prisoner. . . . And beware, how in making the *portraiture*, thou breakest the *pattern*. For Divinity maketh the love of ourselves the *pattern*; the love of our neighbours but the *portraiture*."—(Of Goodness and Goodness of Nature, 1625).

It is exactly what Timon is doing in his speech, expecting his friends to be to him *what he had been to them*. In another Essay, Bacon writes:—"It was a sparing speech of the ancients to say, *That a friend is another himself*" (*Essays. Friendship*, 1625). Timon, in his extremity, sends his servant, Flaminius, to Lucullus, in order to borrow fifty talents from him. The servant discovers the friendship of this flatterer for Timon is false, and on being offered a bribe, (to say he had not seen Lucullus) exclaims of the latter:—

Let molten coin be thy damnation,
Thou disease of a friend, and not himself.

—Act III. i. 55, 56.

That is to say,—a true friend will love his neighbour as himself, making, in Bacon's words, "*love of ourselves the pattern*." Lucullus was not "*another himself*" of Timon's, but only a flattering lord—one of Timon's "*painted friends*," as they are described by his steward. Bacon observes:—"For a crowd is not company, and faces are but a gallery of pictures" (*Friendship. Essays*, 1625). It is just in this spirit that Timon comments upon the painter's art:—

The painting is almost the natural man;
For since dishonour traffics with man's nature
He is but outside.—Act I. 1.

And when Timon's steward exclaims :—

To have his pomp and all what state compounds,
But only painted like his varnished friends.—Act III. ii.

it is just possible to surmise, that in this introduction of poet and painter, together with their arts, into the Play, some very deep moral purpose is prefigured. Certainly, if Timon had not based his *portraiture* of his friends feelings, upon the *pattern* of his own love towards them, he would not have been broken ! I do not insist that this is what Bacon virtually means, but it certainly suggests the idea that it is a mistake to judge men (expect them to be) replicas, or portraits of ourselves. It must be remembered Bacon's remarks revolve upon the errors, of goodness and goodness of nature.

In the same *Essay of Friendship*, he writes :—" Want of true friends, as it is the reward of perfidious natures, so it is an imposition upon great fortunes. The one deserves it, the other cannot escape it. And therefore it is good to retain sincerity, and to put it into the reckoning of ambition,—that the higher one goeth, the fewer true friends he shall have."—*Essays. Friendship*, 1625.

There is little doubt the painter's art is introduced as a satire upon superficial or stage friendship. Timon exclaims with irony to the painter :—

Thou draw'st a counterfeit
Best in all Athens : thou'st indeed the best ;
Thou counterfeitest most lively.—Act V. i. 83.

Now the Play of *Timon of Athens*, really revolves largely, upon false, or *counterfeit friendship*, and the painter and poet, are proved in this scene, I quote from, to be of the same fellowship, as the other flatterers* who undid Timon. They were "*counterfeit coin*" (*John* III. i. 99). And therefore the student will understand, that the *arts* brought in here, are as venal, and corrupt as the rest. Bacon says :—" There is little friendship in the world, and least of all between equals, which was wont to be magnified. That that is, *between superior and inferior, whose fortunes may comprehend the one the other*" (*Expense. Essays*, 1625). This is fully borne out in this Play. Timon's only real and genuine friends are his servitors, particularly his faithful steward Flavius :—

* *Apemantus*.—Art not a poet ?

Poet.—Yes.

Apemantus.—Then thou liest : look in thy last work, where thou hast feigned him a worthy fellow.—Act I. i.

Flavius.—All broken implements of a ruin'd house.

Third Servant.—Yet do our hearts wear Timon's livery,
That see I by our faces; we are fellows still;
Serving alike in sorrow; leak'd is our bark,
And we, poor mates, stand on the dying deck
Hearing the surges threat.—Act IV. ii. 16—21.

Bacon declares that: "*A natural and secret hatred and aversion towards society in any man, hath somewhat of the savage beast.*" Nobody can doubt this was written with an eye upon Timon, who remembers, the texts quoted already connecting him with a beast, or with this speech:—

Timon.—Therefore be abhorr'd all feasts, societies, and throngs of men,
His semblable, yea himself, Timon disdains.*—Act III. iii.

Bacon at the same time, in the same context, says that: "*Whosoever is delighted in solitude is either a God, or a beast*" (*Essays. Friendship*, 1625). Observing, that these two contradictions, contain, or embrace, much truth and untruth, according to the motives, and character of the man, who thus shuns his fellowmen. The motive may be one of pure misanthropy, or it may be incited, as Bacon tells us, by a desire "to separate oneself for a higher conversation," as was the case with Apollonius, Epimenides, and others. That is to say, *Contempt of nature*, may be the outcome of disappointment, or it may arise from *Philosophy*,† if it includes itself, as seems *Timon's case*:—

Not nature
To whom all sores lay siege, can bear great fortune
But by contempt of nature.—Act IV. iii. 6.

Bacon, in his Essay, condemns *Misanthropy* of Timon's character, who he calls "*the very errors of nature*," meaning that nature had produced something at variance, or cross purposes with herself—that is as *hating or disdaining themselves*, as we discover in the texts just cited from the Play. For surely nature seems to commit a mistake when she constructs a being who is at war with herself, and with his own nature at the same time? Bacon's words about Timon are:—"Such dispositions are the *very errors of human nature* (*Vomicas et Carcinoria—i.e. Boils and Cancers*)."

Bacon compares true friends to *physicians*:—"A principal fruit of friendship, is the ease and discharge of the fulness and

* Apemantus, who belonged to the school of Philosophy, called Cynics, is of the same spirit:—Apemantus, that few things loves better than to abhor himself.—Act I. i. 237.

† Bacon observes:—"Pride if it ascend from contempt of others to a contempt of itself, at last is changed into philosophy."—(*Antitheta* XIV.)

swelling of the heart, which passions of all kinds do cause and induce. We know *diseases*, and stoppings, and suffocations of all kinds, are the most dangerous in the body. And it is not otherwise in the mind."—(*Essays. Friendship*, 1625).

Bacon goes on to describe how we take various medicines to open the liver, so in like manner the fruit of friendship is the opening of the heart, and discharge of the mind when oppressed. In short friendship acts as a cure, or heal-all for mental troubles. Compare this speech of Sempronius, touching Timon :—

His friends, like *physicians*
Thrive, give him over : must I take the cure upon me ?
—Act III. iii. 11.

In thorough keeping with this idea Timon's false friends are called diseases :—" *Thou disease of a friend*."—Act III. i.

"The best preservative to keep the mind in health, is the faithful admonition of a *friend*. The calling of a man's self, to strict account, is a *medicine*, sometimes too piercing and corrosive. . . . Even as you would call a *Physician*, that is thought good, for the cure of the disease, you complain of, but is unacquainted with your body ; and therefore, may put you in way for a present cure, but overthroweth your health in some other kind ; and so cure the disease, and kill the patient."—(*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

The disease Timon suffered from was poverty :—

And his poor self,
A dedicated beggar to the air,
With his *disease* of all shunn'd poverty,
Walks like contempt alone.—Act IV. i. 12.

It may be pointed out that Timon's moral sickness begins to mend in his solitude :—

My long sickness
Of health and living now begins to mend,
And nothing brings me all things !—Act V. iii. 189.

Timon in the end refused all friendship, realising Bacon's words :—"The parable of Pythagoras is dark, but true—*Cor ne edito*—eat not the heart. Certainly if a man would give it a hard phrase those that want friends, to open themselves unto, are cannibals of their own hearts."—*Friendship*, 1625.

Bacon writes :—"The poets feign that when Plutus (which is riches) is sent from Jupiter, he limps, and goes slowly, but when he is sent from *Pluto* he runs and is swift of foot. Meaning that riches gotten by good means, and just labour, pace slowly. But when they come by the death of others (as

by the course of inheritance, testaments, and the like) *they come tumbling in upon a man. But it might be applied likewise to Pluto, taking him for the devil.*"—(*Riches. Essays*, 1625).

Timon's bounty is described by a lord, in the Play, thus:—

He pours it out; *Plutus*, the God of gold,
Is but his steward: no meed, but he repays,
Sevenfold above itself.—Act I. i. 287.

Bacon is very plainly here, deriving the name *Plutus* from the Greek *Ploutos* (or riches). "When goods encrease, *they are encreased that eat them*," observes Solomon (*Ecclesiastes* v. 11), a point illustrated in this Play abundantly, as is also that other saying: "There is a sore evil which I have seen under the sun, *namely, riches kept for the owners thereof to their hurt.*"—(*Ib.* v. 13).

Bacon writes:—"For certainly great riches, have sold more men, than they have bought out" (*Riches. Essays*, 1625). It is very evident Bacon conceived *Plutus*, as a prototype for everything evil. For, in direct connotation with the passage quoted, Bacon adds: "For when riches come from the devil (as by fraud and oppression, and unjust means) they come upon speed" (*Riches*, 1625). And Bacon leaves us in no doubt of how, he is thinking of Timon and his flatterers, when he writes:—"Riches gotten by service (*Servitum Regum, aut Magnatum, i.e., Services of Kings or great persons*), though it be of the best rise, *yet when they are gotten by flattery, feeding** (*sese flectendo*, 'bending oneself to'), humours, and every other servile conditions, they may be placed amongst the worst."—(*Riches*, 1625).

Immediately, on reading this, we remember Timon's banquets, and his flattering but false friends, who were everlastingly *bending themselves before Timon*:—

Apemantus.—What a coil's here!

Serving of becks and jutting out of backs!

Thus honest fools lay out their wealth on court'sies.

—Act I. ii. 239.

Bacon writes of Expense:—"It is no baseness for the greatest to descend and look into their own. Some forbear it, not upon negligence alone, but doubting to bring themselves into melancholy, in respect they shall find it broken, but would be cured without searching. He that is plentiful

* Ah, when the means are gone that buy this praise
The breath is gone whereof this praise is made:
Feast won, fast lost.—Act II. iii. 178.

in expenses of all kinds, will hardly be preserved from decay."—(*Expense*, 1625).

Flavius.—No care, no stop; so senseless of expense
That he will neither know how to maintain it,
Nor cease his flow of riot: takes no account
How things go from him, nor resumes no care
Of what is to continue.—Act II. ii.

Nor will he know his purse, or yield me this,
To show him what a beggar his heart is,
Being of no power to make his wishes good.—Act I. ii. 200.

Bacon says:—"Costly followers are not to be liked, least while a man maketh his train longer, he make his wings shorter."—(*Followers and Friends. Essays*, 1625).

This is paralleled, by the Senator's speech, touching the plucking of Timon, by his importunate creditors:—

For I do fear,
When every feather sticks in his own wing,
Lord Timon will be left a naked gull,
Which flashes now a phoenix.—Act II. i. 29.

Bacon observes:—"The improvement of the ground, is the most natural obtaining of riches; for it is our great Mother's blessing, the earth, but it is slow."—(*Riches*, 1625).

Timon is presented in the Play as digging, and we may suppose improving the earth, and "obtaining of riches," or gold, by so doing, and we find him applying this epithet of mother, as Bacon does, to the earth:—

Common mother, thou [*Digging*]
Whose womb immeasurable, and infinite breast
Teems and feeds all.—Act IV. iii. 177.

Bacon opens his Essay upon *Riches*, with these words:—"I cannot call riches better than the baggage of virtue. The Roman word is *Impedimenta*. For as the baggage is to an army, so is riches to virtue. It cannot be spared, nor left behind, but it hindreth the march."—(*Riches*, 1625).

This is a very clear hint for the Third Scene of the Fourth Act of this Play, where Alcibiades is introduced marching with his army upon Athens, and coming upon Timon, just at the moment when he has discovered and dug up gold. Timon exclaims of the gold:—

Come, damned earth,
Thou common whore of mankind, that putt'st odds
Among the rout of nations, I will make thee
Do thy right nature. [*March afar off*] Ha! a drum?
—Thou art quick,

But yet I'll bury thee : thou'lt go, strong thief,
 When gouty keepers of thee cannot stand :—
 Nay, stay thou out for earnest. [*Keeping some gold*].

—Act IV. iii. 41.

Timon gives Timandra, and Phrynia, and also Alcibiades, gold, not however, with the end of benefitting them, but in order that it may act as a curse, and as the enemy of every virtue!

If the student is desirous of discovering how gold, in Timon's opinion, may be made the instrument of furthering wickedness and vice, and impeding virtue, let him read those terrible speeches Timon delivers, in direct connection with his gifts of gold, to those unmistakable impediments to virtue, Phrynia, Timandra, who are introduced as a sort of accompaniment, *or baggages* of armies, and particularly so in past history. To Alcibiades Timon exclaims:—

Follow thy drum ;
 With man's blood paint the ground, gules, gules ;
 Religious canons, civil laws are cruel ;
 Then what should war be ? This fell whore of thine,
 Hath in her more destruction than thy sword,
 For all her cherubim look.—Act IV. iii.

We actually behold the army of Alcibiades delayed and hindered in its march towards Athens, *while it takes gold from Timon*. What does gold do to corrupt virtue ?

Thus much of this will make black white, foul fair,
 Wrong right, base noble, old, young coward valiant,
 Ha, you gods ! why this ? what this, you gods ?
 Why this
 Will lug your priests and servants from your sides,
 Pluck stout men's pillows from below their heads,
 This yellow slave
 Will knit and break religions, bless the accursed,
 Make the hoar leprosy adored, place thieves
 And give them title, knee, and approbation
 With senators on the bench. This, is it
 That makes the wappened widow wed again ;
 She whom the spital house and ulcerous sores
 Would cast the gorge at, this embalms, spices
 To the April day again.—Act IV. iii.

In Bacon's Essay upon *Riches*, he writes :—"The personal fruition in any man, cannot reach to feel great riches. There is a custody of them, or a power of dole and donative of them, or a fame of them ; but no solid use to the owner. Do you not see, *what faineer prices are set upon little stones and rarities ?*"—(*Riches*, 1625).

In the First Act of the Play, a jeweller is introduced,

offering a jewel—evidently a stone of a rare water—to Timon for purchase. When Timon complains of the excessive price asked, the jeweller replies :—

My lord, 'tis rated
As those which sell would give : but you well know
Things of like value differing in the owners
Are prized by their masters.—Act I. i. 168.

Not with fond shekels of the tested gold,
Or stones whose rates are either rich or poor
As fancy values them.—*Measure for Measure*, Act II. ii.

"And yet they are the fittest timber, to make great politics of. Like to knee timber, that is good for ships, that are ordained to be tossed."—(*Of Goodness and Goodness of Nature*, 1625).

When Timon's fortunes have foundered, his servants exclaim of their master :—

Third Servant.—Leak'd is our bark,
And we, poor mates, stand on the dying deck,
Hearing the surges threat.—Act IV. i. 19.

Timon.—Ne'er speak, or think,
That Timon's fortunes 'mong his friends can sink.
—Act II. ii. 240.

These two texts indicate, *Fortune conceived as a ship*, on which one is buffeted and tossed, and which finally may sink. Directly Bacon's Essay upon *Fortune* is examined, the same conception of *Fortune as a ship*, is suggested, by the following :—
"So Cæsar said to the pilot in the Tempest, '*Cæsarem portas, et Fortunam ejus*' (Thou carriest Cæsar and his fortunes)."—(*Of Fortune. Essays*, 1625).

Timon owned his ruin, to his refusal to hearken to the arguments, and *good counsel* of Apemantus, who was never weary of warning him, of the false friends feeding on his bounty.

Bacon writes :—"In counsel is stability. Things will have their first or second agitation. If they be not tossed upon the arguments of *Counsel*, they will be tossed upon the waves of *Fortune*."—(*Of Counsel*, 1625).

Bacon says :—"To take advice of some few friends is ever honourable. For lookers on, many times, see more than gamesters, and the vale best discovereth the hill."—(*Of Followers and Friends*, 1623).

This is very closely exemplified in the case of Apemantus, who comes to look on, and observe the different characters of Timon's pretended friends. When Apemantus appears at the

banquet, given by Timon to his flatterers, the former describes his functions of the mere looker on:—

Apemantus.—Let me stay at thy apperil Timon,
I come to observe, I give thee warning on't.
—Act I. ii.

The conceit of considering those high in the world, as seated on a hill, is prefigured, in the Play, and is applied to indicate Timon's fortune:—

Poet.—Sir, I have upon a high and pleasant hill
Feign'd Fortune to be throned. The base of the mount
Is rank'd with all deserts, all kind of natures,
That labour on the bosom of this sphere
To propagate their states.—Act I. i.

It is Apemantus indeed who sees the entire game, of the noble flatterers who are feeding upon Timon. It is Apemantus who is Timon's true friend, who gives good counsel: "So that there is as much difference, between the counsel that a friend giveth, and that a man giveth himself, *as there is between the counsel of a friend and a flatterer.*"—(*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

Again:—"There is no such remedy against flattery of a man's self, as the liberty of a friend."—(*Friendship. Essays*, 1625).

Apemantus exclaims, with allusion to Timon:—

Oh! that men's ears should be
To counsel deaf, but not to flattery.
—Act I. ii. 256.

In just this same spirit Bacon quotes from Proverbs:—"Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful" (Prov. xxvii. 6). "A flattering mouth worketh ruin" (Ib. xxvi. 28); "A man that flattereth his neighbour spreadeth a net for his feet" (Ib. xxix. 5).

Indeed this Play, like that of *King Richard the Second*, is a complete sermon upon the dangers of great fortune, when exposed to flattery. When Lucullus (one of Timon's false flattering friends) refuses to lend Timon money, Strangers who are looking on observe:—

First Stranger.—Do you observe this Hostilius?
Second Stranger.—Ay, too well.
First Stranger.—Why, this is the world's soul?
And just of the same piece
Is every flatterer's spirit.
—Act III. iii.

Apemantus exclaims:—

He that loves to be flattered is worthy of the flatterer.

—Act I. i. 232.

In his Essay upon *Vain Glory*, Bacon writes:—"Glorious men are the scorn of wise men; the admiration of fools; *the idols of parasites*" (*prædæ et escæ*).—(*Essays*, 1625).

Apemantus.—Like madness is the glory of this life,
As this pomp shows to a little oil and root.
We make ourselves fools, to disport ourselves;
And spend our flatteries, to drink those men
Upon whose age we void it up again,
With poisonous spite and envy.

—Act I. ii. 139.

* * * * *

Thou giv'st so long, Timon, I fear me thou wilt give away thyself in paper shortly. What need these feasts, pomps, and vainglories?—*Ib.* 249.

Bacon's Latin,—(*prædæ et escæ*),—(as an afterthought, or variation, of the earlier Essay,) where the equivalent is—"the idols of parasites"—is a sort of revelation. For Timon in his full fortunes is depicted as the *idol of the parasites* (vermin) who made him both their prey and their booty. For example, the stage directions read, "*The Lords rise from table, with much adoring of Timon, etc.*" (Act I. ii. 150). Indeed, there is little doubt, that when Bacon wrote upon *Praise* (*Flattery*), as follows, the text applied to Timon, as well as to Richard the Second:—"Men are praised maliciously to their hurt, thereby to 'stir envy and jealousy towards them: *Pessimus genus inimicorum laudantium* (the worst sort of enemies are flatterers). Insomuch as it was a proverb amongst the Grecians; that, *He that was praised to his hurt, should have a push rise upon his nose*; as we say: *That a blister will rise upon one's tongue, that tells a lie.*"—(*Praise. Essays*, 1625).

In conformity with this, Timon is found, after his ruin, exclaiming out of the bitterness of his experience, to the senators who seek him:—

Speak, and be hanged!
For each true word a blister! And each false
Be as a cauterizing to the root o' the tongue,
Consuming it with speaking!—Act IV. i. 134.

W. F. C. WIGSTON.

THE CIPHERS OF ALMAZAN, 1485 TO 1509, AND OTHERS SUBSEQUENTLY USED.

THERE is a book not lying within reach of many readers, but which contains some passages much to our purpose at the present time, when *nolens volens* the attention is being directed to the question of the use and variety of cipher writing. We therefore give some extracts which may be acceptable to such as have not time or opportunity for private research.

The book in question is entitled "*Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers, Relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, Preserved in the Archives at Simancas and Elsewhere*, Vol. I., HENRY VII., 1485—1509," &c. (edited by G. A. Bergenroth; pub., Longmans, 1862).

The Editor having described the exceeding difficulty of deciphering the confused old Spanish documents of Ferdinand Alvarez (Secretary of State to Ferdinand and Isabella), goes on to say that a great improvement is observable under his successor.

"Almazan was, if not the inventor, at any rate the person who introduced cipher into Spain. The whole history of ciphered writing, from its rudest beginnings until it had become so complicated a system that even those statesmen who were the most thoroughly initiated into the art were unable to make use of it, may be studied in the papers belonging to a period of about fifteen years. On some of the deciphered despatches marginal notes, such as the following, may be found: 'Nonsense;' 'Impossible;' 'Cannot be understood,' or, 'Order the ambassador to send another despatch.' After the year 1504, in which Queen Isabella died, it was found necessary to return to more simple systems of cipher."

Mr. Bergenroth then explains the enormous difficulties which he encountered in the deciphering, and how he finally succeeded in making 20 keys, by means of which he was able to interpret and to publish the whole of the ciphered despatches in the Archives of Simancas. He concludes the Introduction to the volume by some "Remarks" upon the cipher, from which the following passages are abridged:—

"There are different essays of the art of deciphering. In almost all of them the reader is directed, first, to discover what signs occur the most frequently, and to judge thereby whether they represent vowels or consonants. This method,

if it be useful for discovering any other cipher, is useless to anyone wishing to discover the ciphers of Almazan. Where each letter of the alphabet may be rendered in 50 different ways, it is quite impossible to say which letter occurs oftenest. Besides, where one sign represents a whole word, or a whole phrase, letters cannot be counted.

"The ciphers which occur in Spanish despatches during the time of Ferdinand and Isabella are of very different kinds. The most simple is the one where Arabic numerals are interspersed with common writing.* . . . Another kind soon followed, in which Roman numerals were employed. But the number of signs belonging to this system was, from the first, much greater than the former, and soon increased from hundreds to thousands. The key to a cipher which contains two or three thousand signs is a little dictionary. If each sign represent a whole word, or even a whole phrase, it is not difficult to compose a letter without having recourse to a single word in plain writing. Letters written entirely in cipher first occur in the year 1495, and are composed of Roman numerals. . . . (To these) an alphabet is added, in which each letter of the alphabet is expressed by a single sign. . . . Each vowel is represented by five different signs, and each consonant by four. The number was soon increased . . . to 14 or more signs, so that more than 500 signs corresponded to the Spanish alphabet. To this complicated cipher was added a third kind. Certain significations were attached to monosyllabic words.† For instance, 'bax'='ciertamente,' 'dem'='gente de armas,' 'nam'='yo, el Rey Catolico.' Signs without meaning, *nichil importantia*, as they were termed, were intermixed with the cipher. . . . These different signs were constantly mixed up, not only in the same letter, or on the same page, but in the same sentence, or even in one word. For instance,

DCCCCLXVIII.	le	N o γ	malus	ζ	=enviando (sending).
DCCCCLXVIII.	=en		malus		=nichil importans.
le	=vi		ζ		=o
N	=a				
o	=n				
γ	=d				

* This is the kind used by Standen, Morrison, and others in the letters found in the Tenison Collection, Lambeth Palace.

† The points here enumerated nearly all accord with some of the Anthony Bacon correspondence at Lambeth Palace.

" . . . I did not discover any of the keys to the cipher in a methodical manner. Whilst engaged in copying, I was constantly on the watch for a weak point, convinced that no man can for any length of time succeed in so completely disguising his thoughts, but that he will occasionally betray himself to a close observer."

The observant decipherer continues his explanation with a detailed account of how he gradually gained hints which raised his imagination and enabled him first to make successful *guesses* at the meaning of some of the signs. These ascertained and fixed, enabled him to reach others, and so on from one to another, until a key was so far completed that no serious difficulties remained even in this exceedingly complex cipher.

"Generally, I had to proceed from small beginnings. Had the discovery of all the subsequent signs of a system of cipher been as difficult as the beginning, I should, most probably, have never been able to complete my work. But, however a man may strive to act incoherently, he will not be able to free himself from certain rules. There never has been even a poet who, in the boundless exercise of his imagination, has succeeded in creating the character of a madman whose words have not been subjected to certain, albeit unsound, laws.

"The cipher used in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella was, as I have already hinted, of a twofold character. In one kind of keys each sign expressed only one letter of the alphabet, and in the other each sign represented a whole word, or a whole phrase. The writing in cipher, which signifies letters, is so far like common writing that all the signs for the letters which form the word must be put in their natural order . . . only each letter may have an unlimited number of signs to represent it. . . . The cipher in which each sign represents a whole word presents greater difficulties; . . . still the signs are discoverable. The first thing to be done is to bring all the signs of such a cipher into their order. The signs are before our eyes, and we shall therefore be enabled by close observation to discover the rule according to which they have been framed . . . the order must have some relation to the alphabet. If the reader be only fortunate enough to discover the meaning of a few—say, 10 or 20—signs which are distributed over different portions of the key, he will find it easier to fill up the intervening spaces. . . . If a man had to read a book in a language of which he knew nothing, and had to consult the dictionary

for every word, he would find his task a tedious one. Yet that will give but a faint idea of what I had to undergo ; for I had not only to consult my keys for every word, but for every letter. The labour entailed was rendered all the greater as, in the magniloquent language of Spain, many words contain 10 and more letters."

The cryptographer next meets the question as to whether his decipherings are trustworthy; and confidently affirms that they must be so. 1. Because, after having deciphered the despatches, he found copies of some of them in plain writing, and these original drafts corresponded with his interpretations. 2. After his return from Madrid, "The Key of Puebla" and fragments of two other keys were given to him, and were found to coincide with the keys which he himself had formed. Being correct so far as these different keys went, there is no reason why the rest of his work based upon the same plan should not be equally correct.

"Keys to ciphers are real keys, and though in the estimation of the statesmen of that time I should have been considered a thief, still, so far as the keys are concerned, they must have been like the original ones, or they would not have corresponded to the words of the lock."

Anyone truly concerned with the newly-revived study of ciphers should read and consider this interesting paper by Mr. G. A. Bergenroth on the old methods employed by statesmen of the Spanish Court in the 15th and early part of the 16th centuries. Such were the ciphers with which Francis St. Alban was acquainted, and his ostensible object in the composition of new ciphers was to make them *easier*, both to the writer and the reader. No wonder that he should have perceived the necessity for making his own inventions less complicated than those previously used. The Spanish methods read by means of Mr. Bergenroth's "Twenty Keys" were not ingenious, or cleverly contrived; they did not depend upon mathematical or geometrical rules, or artfully-contrived marks and different founts of type, neither did they work with a "dial," "clock," or "wheel," on the principle adopted later on by Wheatstone, nor by the exchange of two signs, after the fashion of the "Morse alphabet." All these were inventions made or adapted to his purposes by the "arch-contriver," whose ciphers are now being so eagerly traced and in part unravelled. They are probably to be reckoned as amongst those things of which he said that, so long as they were not known, men pronounced them impossible; but as

soon as they were known, men wondered that they had not seen them all along. In his *Promus* jottings he notes, "Everything is subtle till it is conceived," and, "Every prince has his cipher."

THE "COMEDY OF ERRORS."

THE *Comedy of Errors* is the earliest of the Plays known as Shakespeare's, of whose production we have any definite record. A *Henry VI.* had been staged by Henslowe in 1591, and a *Titus and Andronicus* in 1593, but these are supposed to have been the rough hewn plays which had not as yet been shaped by the master-hand and vitalized by its touch. The peculiar circumstance and chrisom which swathed the firstling of the great dramatist on its introduction to "this great stage of fools" were briefly these.

In 1594 the youth of Gray's Inn determined to revive the Christmas revels in which they had been wont to excel, but which for some reason or other had during the few previous years been intermitted. Their device was to turn Gray's Inn into a mock court and kingdom, to elect a prince with all officers of law, state, and household, they "raised treasure" partly by a benevolence from those present and partly by letters in the nature of privy seals to those away. They sent to "their ancient allied friend the Inner Temple" requesting that an Ambassador from that State might be sent to reside among them. On December 20th, the Prince was enthroned with all state in the great hall of Gray's Inn, the King-at-Arms proclaimed his style and blazoned his arms; the Champion rode in full armour and threw down his gage in defiance of all other claimants; the Attorney made his gratulatory speech; the Solicitor summoned all his homagers and tributaries to appear and do homage, a burlesque pardon was read for every possible kind of offence; the Prince made a short speech and the evening ended in dances.

So great had been the success of the first night that it was resolved to hold certain "grand nights" on which something special should be performed. The first of these was held on December 28th, when the Ambassador from the Temple having arrived in great state together with a splendid company of "lords, ladies, and worshipful personages, that did expect some notable performance," the throng grew suddenly so great and the stage so crowded with beholders that there was

not room enough for the actors and nothing could be done. The Ambassador and his train retired in discontent; when the tumult partly subsided, dancing and revelling were indulged in and afterwards "a *Comedy of Errors* like to *Plautus* his *Menechmus* was played by the players," "so that night," continues the historian, "was begun and continued to the end in nothing, but confusion and errors; whereupon it was ever afterwards called the Night of Errors."

Here we find ourselves confronted by the curious fact that the first staging of a Shakesperian Play took place, not at the Theatre, the Curtain, or the Rose, but at Gray's Inn where Francis Bacon was a student, and at a performance at which Bacon himself assisted.

On December 29th, "The Prince" and his council appointed a commission of Oyer and Terminer to inquire into the disorders of the previous night, who found that they were supposed to be caused by a certain "sorcerer or conjurer" who was arraigned before a jury on several charges, of which the last was "that he had foisted a company of base and common fellows to make up our disorders with a Play of errors and confusions."* It would be interesting to know who the "sorcerer or conjurer" was, we only know that the fame of Friar Bacon was great in the days of Elizabeth as a conjurer (see Greene's "Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,") and that it may have been a punning allusion to Francis. But however this may have been, we find that the trial ended in the committal of the conjurer, the Attorney, the Solicitor, and the Master of Requests to the Tower. After which broad parody of justice, the Council held a consultation for the recovery of the lost honour of Gray's Inn, and determined that an entertainment of a superior kind should take place on January 3rd. First a masque was performed embodying the reconciliation and renewal of brotherly love between Grains and Templarius. Then the Prince invested the Ambassador and twenty-four of his retinue with the Order of Knight of the Helmet and the articles of the Order were read.

"This being done there was a table set in the midst of the stage before the Prince's seat and there sate six of the Lords of his privy council" who delivered addresses to the Prince on War, Philosophy, Buildings and Foundations, Treasure,

*I have given these extracts from the "*Gesta Grayorum*" as quoted by Spedding in his "*Life of Bacon*." Perhaps some further particulars might be gleaned from Nichol's "*Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*" where the "*Gesta*" are given in full. I have been unable to obtain a copy.

Virtue, and Sports, and Pastimes, after which the Prince returned his answer to them.

"The performance of which night's work being very carefully and orderly handled, did so delight and please the nobles and the other auditory, that thereby Gray's Inn did not only recover their lost credit and quite take away all the disgrace that the former Night of Errors had incurred; but get instead thereof so great honour and applause as either the good reports of our honourable friends that were present could yield, or we ourselves desire."

On this Spedding remarks "That the speeches of the six Councillors were written by him (Bacon), and by him alone, no one who is at all familiar with his style, either of thought or expression, will for a moment doubt; they carry his signature in every sentence."

Now we know that in 1587 eight members of the Society of Gray's Inn were concerned in writing a Play *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, one of whom was Francis Bacon. The Play was performed at Greenwich in February, 1587-8, before Queen Elizabeth, and is spoken of by Collier as having "a richer and nobler vein of poetry running through it than is to be found in any previous work of the kind."

The question now comes, If in 1587 the students of Gray's Inn had been capable of producing a better Play than any that had previously occupied the stage, what should have led them to apply to an obscure actor like Shakespeare, not one of whose Plays had seen the light, to provide them with a Play with which to retrieve the lost honour of Gray's Inn?

Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* had been published in 1593, and his "Lucrece" in May, 1594, but as a dramatist he was quite unknown; not until 1598 did any Play appear authenticated with his name, but Lilly, Peele, and Kyd, were then at the height of their dramatic fame, and had the students of Gray's Inn been incapable of providing a Play for themselves, it is to the dramatists of established reputation we should have expected them to appeal. These things are a mystery which at present we are unable to solve, but we know that Bacon assisted in the production of a Gray's Inn Play in 1587, that in 1612 he was the "chief contriver" of a masque presented by the gentlemen of Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple, on the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth. What is more likely than that he had a hand in the production of the Play which in 1594 was acted at the revels at Gray's Inn?

E. S. ALDERSON.

FRANCIS BACON'S FRIENDS AND ASSOCIATES.

THE subject of this short paper is "Francis Bacon: his Friends and Associates," a matter hitherto singularly overlooked and neglected. There is an old proverb, "Tell me your company, and I will tell you what you are," but in trying to find out what Francis Bacon truly was, too little inquiry has been generally made as to his "company," neither do his biographers sufficiently enlighten us. Many interesting names just appear, and pass over the pages of the regulation "*Lives*" set before the public; foreign names such as *Galileo*, *Fulgentius*, *Bruno*, *Montaigne*, and many more *English* names presently to be noticed. Like fleeting shadows they come and go, unnoted by the inobservant or uninterested, but furnishing useful hints to the pioneer corps striving to clear the way to true discovery.

We cannot depend even upon the *Index* of any Baconian "Life" to guide us faithfully to the required particulars. Search the *Index* to James Spedding's seven 8vo vols. of Bacon's "*Letters and Life*," and you will find no entry of any masque, revel, device, or entertainment, none of the "*Order of the Helmet*," the "*Masque of the Indian Prince*," or of "*Philantia, or Self-love*," although these pieces are described, and some printed in these volumes. So on with many other matters pertinent to our inquiries. The authors or publishers of such works are evidently perfectly well informed as to what facts will lead up to the true revelation of "Bacon," these are therefore either omitted, or cleverly introduced so as to pass unnoticed by the "General." This will be the experience of all who follow this game, "*If*" (as Lear says), "*you will catch it, you must catch it by running*."

Now we all know that Bacon's Courtly friends and associates, the Dukes of Buckingham and Norfolk, the Earls of Arundel, Derby, Essex, Leicester, Northampton, Nottingham, Pembroke, and Montgomery, Shrewsbury, Suffolk, Sussex, and Warwick; the Lords Buckhurst, Clinton, Dudley, Dorset, Herbert, Howard, Hunsdon, Rich, Sackville, Sheffield, Strange, Willoughby, and others, *kept theatrical companies*.

Your attention is asked to this point, for hereby hangs a tale. Can there be clearer evidence of the little interest which has been generally taken in Francis Bacon, or of how little his many critics have put two and two together concerning him, than in this, that none should have observed the fact *that of all the great Courtiers of his time, Francis Bacon was one*

of the few who did not keep a theatrical company, whilst it was he alone who stood up in defence of the Theatre, and as an absolute advocate of the use of Stage Plays?

Readers of BACONIANA are acquainted with the eulogies of Francis Bacon, written by some thirty of his friends. In one it is declared that in no light or frivolous spirit did he "*draw on the socks of the Comedian and the high-heeled boots of the Tragedian.*" In his own eulogy of the Stage, he similarly describes the Drama as no mere pastime or amusement, but as a serious matter, a part of his "*Method,*" his stupendous scheme for the "Great Restauration" of fallen and degraded humanity. He considers, as all experience shows to be true, that dull, untrained, ignorant minds should be instructed in the simplest and most natural way—objectively—as we teach little children, by showing them pictures, and by talking to them of things set before their eyes. Hamlet (in his instructions to the Players) tells them that they should "hold a mirror up to nature, show virtue her own figure, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure," or mode of expression. That speech is almost too familiar to be quoted, but how few people have thought of connecting it with a passage in the *Advancement of Learning* (Bk. ii. 13), where Bacon describes "Dramatic Poesy which has the world of its theatre, and which would be of great use if well directed. For the stage is capable of no small influence both of *discipline and corruption.* Now of corruptions in this kind we have had enough, but *the discipline in our time has been plainly neglected.*" Pray read that chapter on Poesy narrative, dramatic, and parabolical, and mark, that the paragraph (of which the above extract forms about one-third) was omitted from the first edition in *English* of the "*Advancement.*" It was inserted into the *Latin* edition (the *De Augmentis*), published when?—published in 1623, just after the issue of the Shakespeare folio. Is this fact without significance? Let me repeat. Within a few months of the publication of the first collected edition of the Plays (some of which had been before the public for thirty years), Bacon writes that *in his times the discipline of the Stage had been plainly neglected*, and esteemed but as a toy. Among the ancients, he adds, it was used as a means of educating men's minds to virtue. The true use and dignity of the Drama as a vehicle of moral instruction, is (as Spedding justly notes), connected in a striking manner with the remark that *men in bodies are more open to impression than when alone.* A magnificent illustration of this has lately been seen on the

stage in the scene in *Julius Cæsar*, where Brutus and Marc Antony by turns address, and stir up the feelings of the buzzing, wavering, multitude, so easily impressed by a fluent speaker.

Shall Bacon's pregnant words about the *corruption and neglect* of the Stage in his day, be passed by unheeded? Note that he does not so much as allude to *Shakespeare, Ben Jonson*, or others of the "Great Dramatists." And note, too, that elsewhere, when touching upon similar deficiencies, he says:—"Of myself I am silent."

To return to the Royal and noble families who kept in their pay, theatrical companies. The fact has been accounted for by the assumption that this was "*the fashion of the time.*" Good words, and easily spoken, but we ask, *why the fashion?* How came it that such a fashion should have sprung up suddenly, at the very time when Puritanism was urging with tongue and pen the baseness and profanity of Stage playing?

And further, is no one surprised to find the Head Masters of St. Paul's and other schools, forming juvenile theatrical companies amongst their scholars, just such "Aerys of children" as Hamlet discusses with Rosencrantz, who describes them as "*the fashion.*" Such children's performances were in complete accordance with Bacon's repeated arguments in favour of an early training in acting as a means towards what he terms "the culture and manurance of the mind," and for gaining the self-possession and grace of gesture needful for a good public speaker.

Many names have been enumerated of the patrons of the Stage (some reputed authors) who were friends or associates of Francis Bacon. But it is not to his patrons or equals whom we should specially look. It is to humbler persons, the so-called "servants" whom he employed as *Secretaries, Travellers, Reporters, Business Managers*, and so forth. The names will not be those of men connected with science, politics, law, or religion; these will afford matter for future consideration. We now speak only of Poets, and others connected with the stage. Lists of names from the enormous correspondence of Anthony Bacon, whom Francis calls his "consorte." These names are found in the "Tenison" collection and in the "Gibson" MSS. in the Library at Lambeth Palace. To these are added lists from Peter Cunningham's "Accounts of the Revels at Court," the "Papers" and the "Memoirs" of Edward Alleyn, the actor, and "Henslowe's Diary."

The last-named six volumes were published by the first

Shakespeare Society, to whom Baconians are deeply indebted. It is the more kind of them to have furnished us with this valuable series since therein are found many clues to "Bacon's" associates, although not one word appears about the man, "William Shakespeare." To be sure the note *Shaxberd*, written in the margin, is annexed to the entries of three Shakespeare Plays performed by his Majesty's Players. But the total omission of any allusion to, or hint of the personality of such an individual as *Shakespeare*, is more than once commented upon by the Editors of these records as being "wonderful" and unaccountable.

For brevity's sake we omit references, merely enumerating some names common to nearly all the lists.

We find the Alleyn family in full force. First on the pages of Francis Bacon's letters appears *Capt. Francis Alleyn*,* a frank, plain-spoken soldier, employed by Anthony to intercede for the release of his servant, Lawson, who had been arrested after the charitable manners of the time, on suspicion of being a Romanist. *Francis Alleyn* seems to have been very useful to the Bacons as a *Messenger* or "Intelligencer."

William Alleyn got himself into political troubles. Bacon calls him "a base fellow and turbulent." *John Alleyn* was theatrical servant to the Lords Howard and Sheffield. He was elder brother to *Edward Alleyn*, the Player, and the ostensible founder of Dulwich College, in which Bacon was curiously interested. How Alleyn found the money to make that noble foundation is only one of the many points which remain "behind the Curtain of the Dark." Henslowe reports two more Alleyns, *Charles*, and *Richard*, and amongst Anthony Bacon's letters are at least six from *Godfrey Alleyn*. There is, therefore, no doubt that the Alleyn family were amongst Bacon's helpers or "servants."

The *Beaumonts*, *John* and *Sir Thomas*, were amongst the adventurers to Virginia. I suppose that all know how hard and successfully Bacon strove for the colonization and defence of this region in the New World. Most of the adventurers, including the *Beaumonts*, were his own friends.

Francis Beaumont dedicated a masque to the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple, thanking them for their help, and adding: "*You especially, Sir Francis Bacon*, as you did then by your countenance and loving affections advance

* The Alleyns spell their names variously even in the same letter. *Alen*, *Allen*, *Allin*, *Aleyn*, *Alleyn*.

it, so let your good word grace, which is able to add value to the greatest and least of matters."

At that time Bacon was Solicitor-General, yet Spedding had no doubt that "*he had a good deal to say about the arrangements,*" and John Chamberlain, an eye-witness, describes the performance as "*a masque, of which Sir Francis Bacon was the chief contriver.*"

Browne is now a common name, yet we may note that *Edward Alleyne's step-father was a Browne*, that *Richard Browne* was one of the company of actors who went beyond seas to perform their plays, and that *Henry Browne* was a faithful servant friend to whom Bacon left a legacy. When in Bacon's anecdotes we find him telling of *Sir Edward Dyer*, the supposed poet, that he asked *Dr. Browne* a question which *Browne* answered "after his blunt and huddling manner," we gain a glimmering as to how it came that the *singularly Baconian works*, *The Religio Medici*, *Cyrus' Garden*, *Common Errors*, *Christian Morals*, *Urn Burial*, and other pieces, should have appeared under the name of this "huddling" doctor. "It is," says John Addington Symonds, "as a great master of diction, as a Rhetorician in the highest sense of that abused word, that this 'Author' (*Thomas Browne*), 'proclaims himself the rival of Jeremy Taylor, and the peer of Milton, in their highest flights of cadenced prose.'"

Rather high commendation is it not of "the blunt and huddling" doctor? The perusal of a few of *Dr. Browne's original letters*, may assure you that Bacon's judgment of his style was not far from the mark. But to continue about Bacon's friends and associates, bound by solemn vows and obligations to hand down the contents of the Cabinets and Presses full of papers which he left unpublished.

Amongst others of the Secret Society were the Careys or Carews. Four of this family were engaged in the Virginian enterprise. *John*, helped with the Revels at Court, and supplied properties. *Richard* is described as a writer chiefly on Topography. He died in 1620. His brother *George* was knighted by Queen Elizabeth, and is the reputed author of an account of France and of the Court of Henri IV. of France. This work, however, was not published, or (we believe) *heard of* until 100 years after his death, which occurred in 1614. This *Sir George Carew* was, from early youth to latest age, very intimate with Francis Bacon; we are therefore fully prepared to learn that *George and Thomas Carew* were Poets—

that *Thomas* was also a dramatist, and that he is said to have written the Masque entitled, "*Cælum Britannicum*," which was performed before the Court at Whitehall in 1633, and greatly admired. In fact, all these men were Bacon's "Masks," engaged in publishing his works.

Abraham Cowley is another "Poet" who (we think) wrote no poetry, but who (we think) published many of Francis Bacon's juvenile effusions in prose and verse. What was his actual history, apart from that given of the author in the poems themselves? He was born, according to various biographers, in 1612, 1616, or 1618, and educated at Westminster School, and Trinity College, Cambridge (Bacon's old college). There he helped with other members of the College to "produce" a Latin Comedy, and he lived in College till he was 36, when he was ejected by the Puritans because of his active partisanship in the Royal cause. For 12½ years he travelled, corresponded, ciphered, and deciphered for the King and Queen. He published no poetry until 1657, when he was about 45 (52?) years of age; and nothing in his supposed paper of "Myself" at all well fits his own history, but it is as hand to glove when applied to records of the youthful days of Francis Bacon. Having published this one volume of apparently juvenile works, Cowley returned to active politics; was thrown into prison, but being released, he again went abroad, and was again employed in helping the Royal cause. On the Restoration taking place, he was overlooked and neglected; but at length, by the interest of the Duke of Buckingham, he obtained the lease of a farm at Chertsey, which returned him £300 a year. He died at the age of 55. No more poetry came forth after that one volume in 1657.

Now anyone who has sufficient interest in these matters to be at the pains to follow the spring to its head, should read the "*Account of the Life of Mr. Abraham Cowley*," printed at the beginning of the 1669 edition of "*The Works*." Dr. Sprat, President of the Royal Society, wrote that Prefatory Account, and his name is signed in crooked printing and in mixed type, at the end of the Life. It is an excellent specimen of a *feigned biography*; pray somebody study it. You will see how ingeniously Dr. Sprat contrives to let you see that *the Author was one of the most wonderful men in the world*, but that Cowley was not the Author. And again to force you to connect "My Lord St. Albans" with Cowley. If Cowley were truly "dependent" upon the Lord St. Alban living in 1656—(of which we can find no trace) it must have been that mysterious

Lord who was a Jermyn—and who somehow popped into the title and out again, and “left no wrack behind.” Dr. Sprat says: “*In his long DEPENDENCE on my Lord St. Albans, there never happened any kind of difference between them,*” and in another place, “I am confident his Lordship will believe it to be no injury to his fame, that in these papers *my Lord St. Albans and Mr. Cowley's names shall be read together by posterity.*” Dr. Sprat has previously said that Cowley had intended to dedicate all his works to Lord St. Albans, as a testimony of his entire respects for him, and as an apology for having left humane, or literary, affairs in the strength of his age, and when he might have been of some use to his country. Why the Dedication was omitted, Dr. Sprat does not say. The natural conclusion upon the whole matter is that he knew perfectly well that Cowley never wrote a word of his supposed works, excepting as an amanuensis writes for his master, on whom he is truly “*dependent.*”

Several members of the Cowley family corresponded with Anthony Bacon. Their letters may be seen in the Tenison Collection, where also, in the Gibson Collection, may be seen letters chiefly of news and politics from four more Cowleys.

Richard Cowley was a Player. His name is to be seen associated with the names of *Burbage* and *Phillips* in the Alleyne Papers, and other documents concerning Plays and Revels, published by the old Shakespeare Society.

In August, 1894, it was pointed out, in a short paper in *BACONIANA* how, in a section of *Much Adoe About Nothing*, the type in the 1623 folio *Shakespeare* is tampered with for purposes of cipher, and apparently, in order to change the correct words *Constable* and *Keeper*, into the names *Cowley* and *Kemp*.

The Constables were connections by marriage of the Bacons. In 1593, *Richard* and *Robert Constable* are found to have been corresponding with *Burbadge* at the same time that Anthony Bacon was receiving letters from the Cowleys.

The *Kemps*, too, were Bacon's cousins. He was evidently fond of *Robert Kemp*, whom he calls “Good Robin,” and with whom he seems to have had pleasant, but unexplained, business. *William Kemp* was one of Lord Strange's company. *Thomas Kemp's* daughter married *Thomas Shirley*; another link, you see, with the supposed galaxy of poets. The *Shirleys* were great travellers, and gatherers of information. *John*, who was once a curate at St. Albans, is said to have turned Romanist, and “thereupon to have become a fertile writer for

the stage ; " but this tale rests upon as slight a foundation as many others.

Of the *Davies* family, *John* and *Lancelot* were Virginians ; *John* helped in the *Revels*, and to him Bacon, wrote, praying him to be kind to *concealed poets*. This *John Davies* is the supposed author of a poem entitled, *Noſce Teipſum*, which two words (Know Thyself) form an entry in Bacon's *Promus*.

Now for the *Fletchers*, another large family of whom *John*, we know, collaborated with *Beaumont*, and who figures as a Dramatist. To *Dr. Giles Fletcher*, Bacon gave a living in Suffolk. His brother, *Thomas Fletcher*, was the Master of St. Paul's School, already mentioned as encouraging the boys to get up theatrical performances. In the *Revels at Court* we find this lively schoolmaster hiring apparel for public and private entertainments. Four other *Fletchers* are named in connection with *Henslowe*, and with the Virginian enterprise.

The noble family of *Herbert* was intimately connected with Bacon and his various undertakings. *Sir Henry Herbert* was Master of the *Revels*. To *Mr. W. H.*, (as we believe) *William Herbert*, afterward Earl of Pembroke, the *Shakespeare Sonnets* were dedicated. In his private theatre at Wilton, "*Measure for Measure*" was first performed, with speeches introduced to incline the king's heart to mercy, at a time when he and his Court were awaiting the trial of *Sir Walter Raleigh*, about to take place at Winchester.

George Herbert, the beloved rector of Bemerton, was the accredited author of the "Temple," and other sacred poems. He wrote two of the Latin elegies in praise of Bacon which we know as the *Manes Verulamiani*.

Space is limited, so only a few words can be said of the *Johnsons*. Englishmen have made up their minds to spell *Ben Johnson's* name without an *h*, though in his own time (and referring to himself and not to his works) it was invariably printed with one. Hereby (perhaps intentionally) confusion is worse confounded when we try to trace the family tree. However, *Ben*, whether with or without his *h*, was one of Bacon's able pens, writing under his roof, eulogising Bacon in precisely the same words which he used to eulogise *Shakespeare*, and finally contributing some Latin verses to the collection of *Verulam elegies*. Is it by mere coincidence that

these Latin verses, signed *Ben Johnson* with an *h*, stand next to verses by *Boswell*?

We would gladly have expatiated a little upon *Sir Philip Sydney* in his character of Poet, and as the supposed Author of the "*Arcadia*;" but the subject is too large for this little paper, and probably no two of our readers have read the "*Arcadia*" from beginning to end. We can but recommend to students an examination of the edition of that work published in 166 $\frac{1}{2}$ just 100 years after the birth of Bacon. It will be seen that *Sir Philip Sydney* did not claim the authorship, but that the "*Arcadia*" was published *anonymously*, and entitled, "*The Countess of Sidney's Arcadia*."

That "*deere ladie*" was "*Sidney's Sister, Pembroke's Mother*," and few readers would, by their own unprejudiced judgment, arrive at the conclusion that the Dedication was from a brother to a sister. It appears indeed that this "*Life and Death of Sir Philip Sidney*," is another example of the "*Feigned Histories*" already spoken of, and the "*Arcadia*" itself one of Francis Bacon's earliest works, by degrees, and through a course of many years enlarged and revised for purposes yet to be explained.

It remains briefly to commend to the reader's notice the history of the Donne family, one of whom married a daughter of Edward Alleyne; another of whom was secretary to Bacon's warm friend, Lord Ellesmere. This John Donne rose to be Dean of St. Paul's, and *of course*, a Poet.*

Sir Edward Dyer also needs inspection. He was a correspondent of the Bacons. Massinger is found to be son of the Earl of Pembroke's Steward. Sir Henry Wotton was one of the Bacon's cousins. Richard Lovelace, the Middletons, Sandys, Shirleys, Butlers, Taylors, Fields, Hobby, all appear in the lists from the Bacon correspondence, with many less well-known names, and others well-known, but not included in the records of the Shakespeare Society.

A great deal is also to be learnt by a close search into the true history of the Rawley, or Raleigh family, of whom Sir Walter Raleigh has been reckoned the Star, and ranged with the scholars and courtly poets of his own day. It is satisfactory to observe that recent biographical dictionaries are beginning to discard this latter fiction. But how much is true concerning the visits of Francis to Sir Walter Raleigh in the Tower? What was the precise relationship between Sir

* See a most interesting *Life of Dr. Donne* (published since this was written) by Mr. Edmund Gosse.

Walter Raleigh, or Rawley, and the Dr. William Rawley who was Francis Bacon's confidential secretary. His collection of MSS. is known to be extant, but strangely "reserved" from the public eye. Where are these Papers?

However, in Bacon's notes is this entry: "*The setting on work my Lord Northampton and Raleigh.*" Bacon then, directed Raleigh's work, perhaps to beguile sad hours in prison, where Bacon is recorded to have visited him. Then, as usual, he handed over to him all the credit of their joint efforts.

Last, not least, a few words of the *Spencers* of whom at least two were Secretaries to Anthony and Francis. *Robert Spencer, George, Urion, and Dr. Spencer* are often met with in our dusty pages. *Gabriel Spenser*, an actor, was killed by Ben Jonson in a duel.

I have observed the significant fact that William Shaksper the man, is utterly ignored, and the name, "*Shakespeare,*" never once mentioned in the six volumes of *Records, Accounts, and Registers published by the old Shakespeare Society.*

Is it not equally significant, that the name of *Edmund Spenser*—the supposed author of the "*Fairie Queene,*" should be also absent from those records, and only introduced in some notes by Peter Cunningham, as if expressly to emphasise the fact that the first (*anonymous*) edition of the "*Shepherd's Calendar*" (1579) when Bacon was eighteen, was dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney, whereas, eight years later, it was declared to have been written by him.

To sum up briefly all that would be said did time permit. When we try to trace the history of any wit, poet, or dramatist of the century from 1560 to 1660, or thereabouts, we invariably find him connected, directly or indirectly, with Francis Bacon. On the other hand, *Shakespere, the Man,* is utterly ignored in the literary records of the age. No accounts of Theatres or Revels, no register of Stationers or Publishers so much as mention him. Neither is *Shakespeare* included in the lists of distinguished wits and authors enumerated by Ben Jonson, Sir Henry Wotton, and others of the time. Bacon is found apparently inviting criticism on *Measure for Measure* and *Julius Cæsar*, as his own Plays. *Richard II.* and *Richard III.* are also included with other Plays and devices in a MSS. list of Bacon's minor writings. But nowhere does Bacon, even when mourning the neglect and degradation of the Stage, allude to *Shakespeare.*

I have spoken only of *subordinates* in the great Bacon

Society—paid servants (as I believe), amanuenses, transcribers, and so forth, of the lighter pieces which he spoke of as "*the Works of my recreation.*" But a similar veil is drawn across the history and works of every great "*author*" so-called of that period; moreover, these authors are inextricably mixed up, not only amongst each other, but bound and linked in all manner of ways with Francis Bacon. Whether they be theologians, philosophers and moralists, or men of science, literature and art, historians or travellers; peep behind their masks or under their hoods, and there is Francis Bacon—*his* theology, *his* philosophy and morality, his experimental science, and universal knowledge enshrined in his own new and noble model of language. Some pieces, to be sure, are in the modelling-clay only, left for others to copy in more solid form. Many others are highly finished, polished with an art upon which no later hand has improved.

The helpers in such works may have been chiefly the "*voluntaries*" (as distinct from the paid subordinates) whom in his private notes, Francis Bacon is seen proposing to enlist. With time and money at their disposal his equals and superiors could render valuable aid. Yet these did but *follow his lead*. In every new enterprise he was (to use his own words) the "*inventor*" and "*contriver*," the "*true Pioneer in the Mine of Truth.*" Others did but rough-hew the dead image for which he had made the design, and which only by his skill could be polished and perfected.

"I leave the work of Time," he says, "to Time's mastery." "Time is the wisest of all things, and the author and inventor every day of new cases." "Men err in disturbing the order of Time and in hastening the end when they are at the beginning." Yes, and Time, too, will alone complete and vindicate the gigantic work for the benefit of the human race in all ages, which was conceived, and in great part accomplished by Francis Bacon.

C. M. P.

A WORD OR TWO ON CANONBURY TOWER.

THERE are several suggestive points of connection to be noted between the old coventual buildings of Canonbury and our Francis St. Alban. There are also obscure particulars well worthy of inquiry.

Originally the property of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, Canonbury House is generally supposed to have been built in 1362, ten years after Edward III. had exempted the Priory of St. Bartholomew from the payment of subsidies, in consequence of their great outlay in charity. Stow says that William Bolton (Prior from 1509 to 1532) rebuilt the house, and probably erected the fine square tower of brick. Nichol, in his "History of Canonbury," mentions that Bolton's rebus of *a bolt in a tun* was still to be seen, cut in stone, in two places on the outside facing Wells' Row. The original house covered the whole space now called Canonbury Place, and had a small park, with garden and offices. Prior Bolton either built or repaired the Priory and beautiful Church of St. Bartholomew, but at his death the connection between Canonbury and monasticism ceased.*

The Tower House was now given by Henry VIII. to John Dudley, Earl of Northumberland, afterwards Viscount Lisle, father of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, whose history has lately risen into fresh and startling importance in consequence of certain deciphered history soon to be submitted to the world's judgment. John Dudley was executed as a traitor when Mary was proclaimed Queen in 1553. The Tower then again became Crown property, and Queen Mary gave it to "Rich Spencer," the magnificent alderman of whom history speaks so fully, giving us even that which it denied us with regard to Francis St. Alban—details of his funeral obsequies. It is from this Sir John Spencer (father-in-law of Lord Compton) that Sir Francis "Bacon," when Attorney-General (1616), leased Canonbury Manor.†

Neither James Spedding nor Hepworth Dixon, nor any biographer of Francis St. Alban, whose writings we have come across, allude to him as having leased this manor and house. The editor of Cassell's "Old and New London," who devotes

* See "Old and New London," Vol. II., p. 269.

† Sir John Spencer's daughter and heiress Elizabeth, married Lord William Compton (created Earl of Northampton), eloping with him from Canonbury Manor in a *baker's basket*. (As I am a man, there was one conveyed out of my house yesterday in this basket.—*Merry Wives of W.* Act IV., sc. ii.)

a whole chapter to this historic place, skips the period of "Bacon's" tenancy, and writes thus :—

"After the Spencers, the Lord Keeper Coventry rented this house. In 1635 we find the Earl of Denbigh detained here . . . and in 1685 the Earl of Denbigh died here."

In a letter to Sir John Spencer, Francis refers to "my brother" as having some connection with the matter. Anthony Bacon died (*or is said to have died*) in the spring of 1601. "Anthony Bacon" (says Chamberlain to Carleton, writing on the 27th of May, 1601) "died not long since."* How then could he be concerned with Francis in the matter of renting Canonbury Manor in 1616?

Meanwhile we note further the great interest which Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, seems to have had in Canonbury, an interest apparently shared by Queen Elizabeth. When in her Royal progresses in 1574, she visited Kenilworth, the occasion was celebrated by the "princely pleasures," of a tournament, and "ambrosial banquet" and "a gorgeous masque." In this masque an apparently irrelevant episode was introduced by the entrance of a "Squire Minstrel," arrayed in a tabard especially designed and embroidered to commemorate Canonbury. The Minstrel sung of it as one of the most ancient and pleasant towns of England, and declared it to be famed for cream, butter, and frumenty. What can have been the underlying idea in this?

In one of Queen Elizabeth's progresses, Nichol also records that she visited Canonbury, and for a long time a picturesque building remained standing which was called "The Queen's Lodge." Nichol gives a picture of this building with a high tower, probably that built by Prior Bolton. We have found no record as to who owned or tenanted the house at this time, but in one account the traditional "Lodge" is described as being fifteen feet square, and as standing at the end of the garden belonging to "Fowler House." An old house in this locality was pulled down in 1800. It contained armorial bearings of the Dudley family, and a splendid chimney-piece containing the arms of St. John of Jerusalem, thus asserting its ancient origin and history.

A curious tradition remains to be noticed. This Canonbury Tower is said to have led by a secret passage to *Kensington Palace*, a distance of more than four miles. This is another point mentioned by Nichol, but omitted by the editor of "Old and New London," who, however, mentions that "a

* Spedding "Letters and Life," III., p. 4.

tradition once prevailed at Islington that the monks of St. Bartholomew had a subterranean communication from Canonbury to the Priory of Smithfield. This notion had arisen from the discovery of brick archways in Canonbury, which seem to have been only conduit heads, and had really served to lead water to the Priory."

This conjecture (for it is no more) appears very plausible, but it is strange that two distinct "traditions" should have been put on record concerning subways from this house to distant points.

The internal arrangements and decorations of Canonbury House are commented on in detail by Lewis, who describes the elaborate ornamental carving, emblematic figures and devices, ships, flowers, foliage, and other objects which Baconians have learnt to associate with the symbolic method of teaching of the Renaissance, and pre-eminently of the "Great Master" himself, but which in the regulation literature of our day are described as "specimens of taste for ornamental carving and stucco work that prevailed about the time of Elizabeth." There are also medallions of three great men who seem to have been in a way models to our Francis—types of the noble Pioneer, the mighty Conqueror, the Master Builder, Alexander the Great, namely Julius Cæsar, Titus Vespasian. Then with the arms of the Dudleys may be seen the arms of Queen Elizabeth in several places, and her initials, "E. R." with the date—1599, at which time the premises were fitted up by Sir John Spencer.

"On the white wall of the staircase, near the top of the Tower are some Latin hexameter verses comprising the abbreviated names of the Kings of England from William the Conqueror to Charles I., painted in Roman character an inch in length, but almost obliterated. *The lines were most probably the effusion of some poetical inhabitant of an upper apartment in the building during the time of the monarch last named, such persons having frequently been residents of the place.*"

It is a pity that the names of some "such persons" are not given; but this would perhaps be too much to expect, considering all the circumstances of the case. Elsewhere we are told that after 1780 the house became "a resort for literary men who craved for quiet and country air." It is not suggested that this very reason may have moved Francis St. Alban to rent this pleasant place, but Samuel Humphreys, "a second-rate poet," Ephraim Chambers, the author of one of the earliest Cyclopædias, and several other Freemason pub-

lishers and printers, as well as poets (including Oliver Goldsmith) lived at or resorted to Canonbury Tower.

To return to whence we started. These jottings are suggestive of several inquiries :—

1. Why did Francis "Bacon," when Attorney-General, take a lease of Canonbury Manor?

2. Did he periodically retire thither, "craving for quiet and country air?"

3. Could this have been the Tower, and the little square room of which we see so often in "Bacon's" portraits the student sitting at a table in a small room with book shelves, and usually a view of a distant town, seen from an elevation. He is known to have written from such a room in a tower, but we supposed it to have been the Campanile-shaped tower at Gorhambury—perhaps both may be found to have been used for the same purpose.

4. What did Francis mean by referring to his "*brother*" as having something to do with the business of renting Canonbury? Was Anthony Bacon the *brother* referred to? If so, did Anthony live much longer than is generally supposed? Where did Anthony die? Where is he buried?

5. Why do "Bacon's" biographers and other writers in speaking of Canonbury, ignore, or studiously omit to mention, his connection with this historic house?

6. Why was Queen Elizabeth so much interested in Canonbury that it could be considered pleasing, or a compliment to her, to introduce a Minstrel Squire, plainly alluding to the delights of the place, into a masque given at Kenilworth in her honour?

Such questions as these are not irrelevant or useless. On the contrary, they are examples of the kind of investigation which should be pursued and driven home. In trying to ascertain what Francis did at Canonbury, we may find him studying those "monastic foundations" of which we have been told that "our poet" (*Shakespeare*) "knew the origin as well as the purposes they served;" at least we may find him secretly writing. In some future paper we hope that the interest of Francis St. Alban in the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, of Canonbury, and Bishopsgate Without, and his connection with them or their representatives, may be more fully discussed.

Since the foregoing pages on Canonbury were penned, other notes important to the subject have been collected from

the Guildhall Library. These jottings furnish so many hints, as well as such positive information, that no apology is made for appending them.

Thomas Tomlins, in his "History of Islington," writes thus:—

"The Earl and Countess, by description Lord and Lady Compton, by indenture 15th February, Jac. 1616, let to the Right Hon. Francis Lord Verulam, Visct. St. Albans, by the name of Sir Francis Bacon Knight,* His Majs. Attorney General, all that mansion and garden belonging to what is called Canonbury House, in the Parish of Islington. . . . for 40 years from Lady-day, 1617."

With regard to the Tower, the same writer states:—

"The great Sir Francis Bacon resided here from February, 1616; as also at the time of his receiving the Great Seal, on 7th Jan., 1618, and for some time afterwards.† . . .

"After the decease of Henry Prince of Wales (in 1612) the Manor of Newington Barrowe was, with other portion of land, on 10th January, 14 Jac., granted upon lease for 99 years to Sir Francis Bacon, Knt., at that time the King's Attorney General, and also Chancellor to Charles Prince of Wales, afterwards Charles I. and others, his law officers and ministers in trust for him, which lease, upon his accession, became merged in the Crown."—Dated at Canonbury, 15th Sept., 1629.

In connection with recent statements concerning the parentage of Francis St. Alban, it will be observed that in Nelson's "History of Islington" the writer states that Queen Elizabeth was at Canonbury Tower in the year 1561, and that she had a "lodge" or summer-house looking into Canonbury Fields. It bore her arms and initials, with the date 1595. "The Tower was encompassed by pleasant fields and gardens, and a salubrious air." The place seems to have been a delightful summer resort—a district full of "cream farms" and flowery meads and walks.

Nelson writes that Queen Elizabeth "went from Canonbury Tower through Houndsden to the Spittle, and down Hog Lane, over the fields to the Charter House; . . . from thence, in a few days, she took her way over the fields to the Savoy."

At this time Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, had pro-

* Created Baron Verulam of Verulam 12th of July, 1618, and Visct. St. Alban Feb. 3rd, 1619.

† The acreage of various "closes" is here given.

perty in Islington, and Henry Carey, one of her half-brothers, lived in Hunsdon House in the same close neighbourhood. To go back a generation, it is said that Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, gave this property to Henry VIII. "and others." Henry VIII. is stated to have lived in one of the manors or large houses in the north-west corner of Newington Green, whilst in the other he kept a number of concubines. A walk close by was known as "King Harry's Walk." One manor, including "Cream Hall," was bestowed upon Prince Henry (died 1618). Another, as we have seen, on Dudley. Possibly, though this is not vouched for, Elizabeth may have passed some happy, idyllic days of her innocent youth in this sweet place with few child-companions excepting "Robin, sweet Robin," her playmate living on the spot, her equal in age, beauty, and talent, though not in rank. Well might they say:—

"We were as twinned lambs that frisked in the sun,
And bleat the one at the other: what we chang'd
Was innocence for innocence: we knew not
The doctrine of ill-doing, nor dream'd
That any did. Had we pursued that life,
And our weak spirits ne'er rear'd
With stronger blood, we should have answered Heaven
Boldly—'Not guilty!' The imposition clear'd
Hereditary ours."

It would be pleasant to know that such were the happy memories recalled to the mind of the much-changed Queen by the "Squire Minstrel" at Kenilworth.

"He had a scutcheon . . . with metal, and colour of the ancient arms of Islington," and a delightful but long-winded description is given of all that he said and wore, and of how, when his minstrelsy was done, he made "a mannerly leg." The point is that he represented "the worshipful town of Islington," and that he bore emblazoned on his breast "a grey mare and silly fole, and three milk tankards," with the motto: "Lac, Caseus, Infans." This the writer renders, "Good milk, and young cheese." We may prefer to read it: "*Milk, cream cheese, a little child,*" or, as it may be construed, "*a foal.*" The allusion is obscure.

“LET IT BE INQUIRED.”

It becomes daily more evident that one thing most needful for the prosecution of our difficult task is that we should have a band of paid experts for purposes of research and inquiry. True research demands both time and experience, and those who possess these qualifications have usually acquired them only by much toil; they cannot afford to give up time to such a work without remuneration. Yet the subjects to be investigated are many and difficult of access, as, for instance, the following, which yet must be capable of solution:—

1. Was Francis (called Bacon) the *true* son of Sir Nicholas and Lady Anne Bacon, or was he their *adopted* son?
2. Was Anthony Bacon (so-called) the brother of Francis?
3. Who was Robert, called Devereux? Was he the true son or only the ward of Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex?
4. Where and when did Anthony and Francis respectively die, and where are any records of their deaths and burial?
5. Why is there any mystery about these things?
6. How much did Francis travel?
7. What was his connection with the Sidneys?
8. And with the Raleighs?
9. Where is the collection of Dr. Rawley's (Raleigh's) MSS.?
10. Where are the letters to which those in the Tenison Collection of Anthony's correspondence at Lambeth Palace, are for the most part answers?
11. How many Libraries did Francis revive or establish?
12. Is it, or is it not true, that there are “reserved” collections and duplicate (differing) catalogues or indexes at most of our chief libraries?—If true, Why?
13. What is the connection between the Society of Anti-quaries, the Royal Society, the Royal Society of Literature, and, indeed, between nearly all the learned societies? Is it true that these are for the most part ruled by Freemasonry, and that the same may be said of all great printing establishments and kindred institutions?

Accurate answers to these questions would be valuable, and we would next furnish another list. But the present need is for *expert researchers*. Who will help to supply us with them?